

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

FIGS. 1 and 2 are labeled “PRIOR ART”.

Attachment: 2 Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of subject application are respectfully requested. By this Amendment, Applicant has canceled claim 9 and added new claim 14. Thus, claims 1-8 and 10-14 are now pending in the application. Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims define patentable subject matter.

I. Drawing Objection

The drawings are objected to because the Examiner maintains that FIGS. 1 and 2 should be labeled as “prior art.” Applicant is submitting replacement drawings in which FIGS. 1 and 2 are labeled as “prior art”. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to withdraw the objection to the drawings.

II. Claim Objection

Claims 2, 7, and 10 are objected to because the Examiner maintains that the term “I-frame” is used in the claim language to refer to two different frames - an Inter-frame and an Intra-frame. By this Amendment, Applicant has amended claim 7 and paragraph [0015] to define an I-frame as an Intra-frame to improve clarity. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to withdraw the objection to the claims .

III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 2 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because the Examiner maintains that the limitation “the frame” lacks an antecedent

basis. By this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 2 and 10 to improve clarity.

Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to withdraw the § 112, second paragraph, rejection.

IV. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the Examiner asserts that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, the Examiner asserts that the claims do not recite any hardware components of the apparatus such that the Examiner interprets the recited apparatus to be software. By this Amendment, Applicant has amended claim 8 to recite a video display apparatus and user interface means. Accordingly, the Examiner is request to withdraw the. § 101 rejection.

V. Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Nakajima et al. (US 6,026,389; hereinafter “Nakajima”). Claims 2, 7, and 10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima in view of Maeda (US 5,353,062). Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima in view of Liou et al. (US 6,278,446; hereinafter “Liou”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Nakajima is directed to a video query and editing system which is capable of querying images without fast-forward and playback operations, to specify an editing start or end point. An edit control window is displayed (11) first, and then a file for query and editing is selected in query and editing file processing 12. In motion picture query processing 13, image query is performed in macro or micro units for the selected file and then the images to be under the query

and editing are displayed. In editing section specification 14, a start point and an end point of a section for the editing are specified out of the images displayed in the motion picture query processing. Editing of a plurality of sections or other files are performed in the same manner as for the above processing if desired. After all the editing sections are determined, the editing sections are played back in editing section playback 17 to confirm the editing parts. Afterward, the images of the corresponding parts are edited in editing 18 to record them as a new file.

By this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 8 to improve clarity and further distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art. Applicant respectfully submits that it is quite clear that Nakajima, alone or in combination with Maeda and/or Liou, do not teach or suggest determining whether a total play time of the selected first video clip is greater than a predetermined time, and playing the selected first video clip or segmenting the selected first video clip into a plurality of second video clips according to a predetermined division reference based on whether the total play time of the selected first video clip determined to be greater than the predetermined time, as required by amended claims 1 and 8.

By this Amendment, Applicant has amended independent claim 6 in manner similar to claims 1 and 8. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 6 should be allowable for similar reasons.

Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 2-5, 7 and 10-13 should be allowable by virtue of their dependency on claims 1, 6 and 8 and for their additional features which are not disclosed by the cited.

VI. New Claim

New claim 14 has been added to claim additional features of the present invention which are not disclosed by the cited art. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 14 should be allowable by virtue of its dependency on claim 18.

VII. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Christopher R. Lipp/
Christopher R. Lipp
Registration No. 41,157

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 10, 2009